

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 05 2005

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. (571) 273-8300 and Fax No. (571) 273-4130 (unofficial) on 05 November 2005.

  
Ernest J. Beffel, Jr.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:

**David Francis MEYER et al.**

Application No. **09/767,810**

Confirmation No. **3728**

Filing Date: **23 January 2001**

Title: **Meta-Content Analysis and Annotation of Email and Other Electronic Documents**

Group Art Unit: 2178

Examiner: Kyle R. STORK

**CUSTOMER NO. 22470**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY FOR 28 OCTOBER 2005**

Sir:

Applicants requested and were granted an in-person interview with Examiner Kyle R. Stork, which took place on **Friday, 28 October 2005**, starting at about 9:00 a.m. EDT. This document summarizes the interview.

Applicants thank Examiner Stork and express their appreciation for his diligent preparation for this interview. We note that for most of the cases interviewed, he conducted a supplemental search and discussed the existing claims with his supervisor, in preparation for the interview.

Prior to the interview, we submitted a proposed agenda, the substance of which is reproduced below:

"The spirit of this interview is to advance the case towards allowance. The last correspondence in this case was the **Response to Office Action**

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

**mailed 26 July 2005**, which the Applicants filed on 26 October 2005. Applicants are prepared to offer amendments after discussion of the Examiner's suggestions, if necessary. Applicants would like to discuss with the Examiner the best way to advance the case towards allowance.

During the interview, we hope to begin with the technology disclosed and also discuss:

1) How the Examiner would propose to combine Ohmura and Pratt? How would other third and fourth references be added to the combination? How would it work?

2) Claims 61, 1, 40 and 81

3) Claims 6 and 7"

The response filed on 26 October reached the Examiner only the day before the interview.

During the interview, we began with a discussion of the technology disclosed, with some background reference to the general business of assignee Inright, Inc. We used at a pair of figures, FIGS. 1 & 7A from the application that illustrate processing an electronic document and a format that an electronic document supplemented with meta-index content might assume in some embodiments. We used FIG. 7A to illustrate an embodiment of some claimed features, with specific reference to features of claim 1.

We turned to the Ohmura and Pratt references and figures from the references that were useful to illustrate how those references work.

Applicants understood that further study and perhaps a supplemental search would be required for this case. Applicants invite a further telephonic interview.

The undersigned can ordinarily be reached at his office at (650) 712-0340 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. PST, Monday through Friday, and can be reached at his cell phone at (415) 902-6112 most other times.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: November 5, 2005

Ernest J. Beffel, Jr., Reg. No. 43,489

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P.O. Box 366  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
Telephone: (650) 712-0340  
Facsimile: (650) 712-0263